

REMARKS

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicant hereby elects the invention of Group II (claims 7-11) for examination, with traverse.

The restriction requirement is traversed because examination of Group I and Group II would not be onerous. As is well known, if search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine the application on the merits, even if the application includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. See MPEP § 803. In the present case, and as indicated in the restriction requirement, the examiner would only have to search three subclasses within class 310 in order to search and examine original claims 1-16. Applicant respectfully submits that searching three subclasses within class 310 would not present a serious burden on the examiner. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the restriction requirement and examine the entire application on the merits.

In the alternative, the examiner is respectfully requested to search and examine Group 1 (claims 1-6) in addition to elected Group II (claims 7-11).

Further, the latest Office action indicates that the replacement drawings received on 19 November 2004 lack reference numbers. Accordingly, new replacement drawings are submitted herewith which include reference numbers.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5-9-05

By: 

Michael J. Thomas,
Registration No. 39, 857

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
(314) 726-7500

MJT/enr

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached six (6) "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include Figures 1-8 and replace all previously filed drawings.